

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action of December 16, 2008, claims 22 and 41 have been amended

Claim 22 has been amended to replace the term "communication" with "communicating."

Claim 41 has been amended to recite "wherein said another communicating party has a private address in a first wireless network and a dynamically allocated varying public address, and wherein said another communicating party is reachable from outside of the first wireless communication network by means of said varying public address." Support for this amendment can be found in claims 1, 22, 25 and 32.

No new matter has been added.

**Claim Objections**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 22 is objected to because of informalities. Appropriate correction has been made with this amendment, thus it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §102**

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-12, 22, 25-28, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al (US 7,039721, hereinafter Wu).

With respect to claims 1, 22, 25 and 32, it is asserted that Wu discloses the entire invention as claimed, with reference made to Figures 1 and 2, and column 3, lines 52-55, column 4, line 25, column 5, lines 37-57, column 6, lines 1-25, and column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Wu is directed to a method for protecting a host located within a computer network, said method including mapping a public host address for a public host to a secret host address for a secret host containing data accessible over the computer network (Wu, Abstract). It is asserted that Wu discloses a wireless terminal being configured to dynamically notify substantially directly the at least one other communicating party of a current public address of the terminal at column 6, line 1-6. This section of Wu states that

the secret host can send packets with the public host IP address so that it appears that all data is coming from the public host when it is actually being sent directly from the secret host. Stated later in Wu, the secret host may also use the IP address of an alternate public host, thus it is asserted by the Office that Wu discloses a wireless terminal configured to have a dynamically allocated varying public address.

However, the alternate public IP address may be used by the secret host if the public host is under attack (Wu, column 6, lines 52-54). Once the attack has ended, the secret host resumes using the original public host IP address (Wu; column 7, lines 2-4). Thus, it is the secret host which selects which public IP address is utilized. Therefore, Wu does not disclose a dynamically *allocated* varying public address, but rather discloses the selection of public addresses by the secret node. The secret node in Wu is not “allocated” an IP address, it uses a first public IP address by way of the public host mapping to the secret node, and then “requests” an alternate public IP address to replace the first public IP address (Wu, column 2, line 64-67; column 6, line 19-22). This is in contrast to the dynamically allocated varying public address of the wireless terminal of the current invention, in which the wireless terminal is not requesting or selecting an alternative public address, rather the address is determined/allocated for the wireless terminal by the network (Application as filed, page 1, line 11-page 3, line 1; page 14, line 11-24). Therefore, it is clear that Wu does not disclose a wireless terminal giving a private address in the first wireless communication network and a dynamically allocated varying public address, as is featured in claims 1, 22, 25, 32 and amended claim 41. Please note that claim 41 has been amended to incorporate the features corresponding to claim 1.

Because Wu does not disclose all of the features of independent claims 1, 22, 25, 32 and amended independent claim 41, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Wu and are in allowable form.

Furthermore, at least in view of their dependency on the aforementioned independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, and 26-28 are also not anticipated by Wu and are in allowable form.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103**

At page 8 of the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Ebata et al. (US 2002/0173310, hereinafter Ebata). However, because claim 9 is dependent from claim 1, which as stated above is not anticipated by Wu, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is not unpatentable over Wu in view of Ebata and is in allowable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Alfred A. Fressola  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 27,550

Dated: March 16, 2009

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955